

Chad Baase

(517)879-8176

Recallgovernorwhitmer@gmail.com

Board of State Canvassers

Attn: Michigan Bureau of Elections

Michigan Department of State

Richard H. Austin Building

430 West Allegan St., 1st Floor

Lansing, MI 48918

Re; Acceptance of Petition Seeking Recall of Governor Witmer

Dear Board Members:

I am respectfully requesting on behalf of the people of the State of Michigan, and myself, Chad Everett Baase, that you review the enclosed hyperlinks to news articles that support each claim as clear and factual.

Reason 1: For signing Executive Orders that prohibit private and public gatherings of any number of people not from the same household which included religious services and required many businesses to close.

<https://www.mlive.com/public-interest/2020/05/as-coronavirus-stay-at-home-order-drags-on-more-michiganders-bend-the-rules.html>

https://www.theoaklandpress.com/news/coronavirus/with-churches-closed-due-to-covid-19-easter-sunday-services-will-be-live-streamed/article_d7c96326-7a87-11ea-aab3-4f6244bf204a.html

<https://www.mlive.com/public-interest/2020/03/whats-open-whats-closed-under-gov-whitmers-coronavirus-stay-at-home-order.html>

Reason 2: For Signing Executive orders that prohibit many services including many surgeries and medical procedures.

Simple Syntax error should not prevent the language from being clear and factual as I am sure you could understand the word as spelled.

<https://www.wlns.com/news/health/coronavirus/karl-mankes-barber-defies-state-orders/>

<https://www.freep.com/story/money/business/michigan/2020/04/22/coronavirus-temporary-windfall-health-insurers/2995388001/>

Reason 3: For making the statement that abortion is a 'Life Sustaining' Medical procedure.

<https://wbckfm.com/governor-whitmer-stated-that-abortion-is-life-sustaining/>

<https://www.foxnews.com/politics/michigan-gov-whitmer-defends-abortion-during-pandemic-as-part-of-life-sustaining-health-care>

Reason 4: For signing executive orders that suspended provisions of the Open Meetings Act that would otherwise require a physical presence, such as, the Michigan Board of State Canvassers.

No press article needed as this meeting will be held remotely due to these orders

Reason 5: Not removing Jackson Sheriff Steve Rand from office for Allegations of mocking an employee with a disability, making a comment about making a snuff film with a courthouse employee, and using racial slurs described in a 264 page packet submitted to Governor Whitmer by Jackson Mayor Derek Dobies.

This is a Recall that this board is very aware of and there is press documentation of when Mayor Derek Dobies did submit said documentation to Governor Whitmer.

<https://www.mlive.com/news/jackson/2019/03/in-264-pages-mayor-tells-gov-whitmer-why-jackson-county-sheriff-should-go.html>

Reason 6: For failure to insure that unemployment applicants are able to reach a representative by phone or in person easily.

I would encourage you to try to reach a Unemployment Representative by phone easily

The Michigan Unemployment Insurance Agencies Phone Number is

866-500-0017. Please try this number from outside random lines so that your number is not set in their computer as a priority call as it may from an Internal State of Michigan Phone.

<https://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/local/michigan/2020/04/29/michigan-unemployment-insurance-website/3049498001/>

Whereas we have provided Clear and factual documentation to support each claim We the People ask that you accept the language as written as clear and factual.

Respectfully Submitted,

Chad Everett Baase

CLARK HILL

Christopher M. Trebilcock
T (313) 965-8575
F (313) 309-6910
Email: ctrebilcock@ClarkHill.com

Clark Hill PLC
500 Woodward Ave., Suite 3500
Detroit, MI 48226
T (313) 965-8300
F (313) 309-6910

clarkhill.com

May 21, 2020

Via email: malermanm@michigan.gov

Board of State Canvassers
Attn: Michigan Bureau of Elections
Michigan Department of State
Richard H. Austin Building
430 West Allegan Street, 1st Floor
Lansing, Michigan 48918

Re: Rejection of Petition Seeking Recall of Governor Whitmer

Dear Board Members:

On behalf of Governor Gretchen Whitmer and the Gretchen Whitmer for Governor candidate committee, I request that the Board of State Canvassers (the "Board") reject as non-compliant with the Michigan Election Law the proposed petition seeking to recall Gretchen Whitmer from the office of governor submitted by Chad Baase on May 12, 2020 (the "Petition"). I am in receipt of the May 15, 2020 notice from the Director of the Bureau of Elections notifying Governor Whitmer of the Petition (the "Notice"). The Notice indicates that the reasons for recall stated in the heading of the Petition read as follows:

For signing Executive Orders that prohibit private and public gatherings of any number of people not from the same household which included religious services and required many businesses to close. For signing Executive Orders that prohibit many services including many surgeries and medical procedures. For making the statement that abortion is a 'life-sustaining' medical procedure. For signing Executive Orders that suspend provisions of the Open Meetings Act that would otherwise require a physical presence, such as, the Michigan Board of State Canvassers meetings. Not removing Jackson Sheriff Steve Rand from office for allegations of mocking an employee for his disability, making a comment about making a snuff film with a courthouse employee, and using racial slurs described in a 264 page packet submitted to Governor Whitmer by Jackson Mayor Derek Dobies. For failure to insure that unemployment applicants are able to reach a representative by phone or in person easily.

As you know, MCL 168.951a(1)(c)¹ requires the Petition to state factually and clearly each reason for a proposed recall. Each reason must also be based upon the officer's conduct during his or her current term of office. The Petition states six distinct reasons for recall:

- (1) For signing Executive Orders that prohibit private and public gatherings of any number of people not from the same household which included religious services and required many businesses to close.
- (2) For signing Executive Orders that prohibit many services including many surgeries and medical procedures [sic].
- (3) For making the statement that abortion is a 'life-sustaining' medical procedure [sic].
- (4) For signing Executive Orders that suspend provisions of the Open Meetings Act that would otherwise require a physical presence, such as, the Michigan Board of State Canvassers meetings.
- (5) Not removing Jackson Sheriff Steve Rand from office for allegations of mocking an employee for his disability, making a comment about making a snuff film with a courthouse employee, and using racial slurs described in a 264 page packet submitted [sic] to Governor Whitmer by Jackson Mayor Derek Dobies.
- (6) For failure to insure that unemployment applicants are able to reach a representative by phone or in person easily.

Under MCL 168.951a(3), the Board must determine by an affirmative vote of three of the members serving on the Board whether each reason for the recall stated in the Petition is factual and of sufficient clarity to enable the officer whose recall is sought and the electors to identify the course of conduct that is the basis of the recall. If any reason for the recall is not factual or of sufficient clarity, the entire recall petition must be rejected. Moreover, when the reason stated in the petition is based on a specific law, the reason for the recall must not misrepresent the content of the specific law.

For the reasons detailed more fully below, the Board is obligated by MCL 168.951a to reject the Petition. The Petition is deficient and does not comply with the Michigan Election Law because it does not identify a course of conduct of an officer that is the basis for the recall. None of the six reasons stated in the Petition are factual and of sufficient clarity. Additionally, the reasons included in the Petition misrepresent the content of executive orders issued by Governor Whitmer.

Deficiency No. 1: Failure to Identify Course of Conduct of Officer That is Basis for Recall

MCL 168.951a requires that a recall petition include clear and factual statements sufficient for the officer whose recall is sought and the electors "to identify the course of conduct that is the basis for the recall." Moreover, the identified conduct must have occurred in the official's current term of office. In this case, while the Petition identifies certain alleged conduct by Governor

¹ A copy of MCL 168.951a is attached as Exhibit 2.

Whitmer, the Petition fails to identify when the conduct occurred or which specific executive orders are the basis for the Petition, and who issued the executive orders:

- (A) While the Petition references “signing Executive Orders” this phrase alone is insufficient to advise Governor Whitmer or the electors of the course of conduct that serves as the basis of the recall or when that course of conduct occurred. The petition does not indicate who signed the executive orders. No date is associated with the referenced executive orders. No specific executive orders are referenced. As of May 21, 2020, Governor Whitmer has issued over 110 executive orders. Yet the Petition fails to reference any specific executive order which might enable Governor Whitmer and the electors to identify the specific conduct that is the basis for recall as the Michigan Election Law requires.
- (B) The same is true as it relates to the following language included in the petition “Not removing Jackson Sheriff Steve Rand from office.” The Petition language does not include any information such as the date of a removal request, date of determination of the request, or which request to remove Sheriff Rand is referenced. The language used is not sufficient to permit Governor Whitmer or the electors to reasonably identify the course of conduct that forms the basis for each reason stated in the Petition. Absent such clarifying language, the Petition is, therefore, insufficiently clear, non-compliant with the requirements of the MCL 168.951a and must be rejected by the Board.

Unless at least three members of the Board vote affirmatively that both claims addressed in Deficiency No. 1(A) and Deficiency No. 1(B) are valid reasons meeting the requirements of the Michigan Election Law, the entire Petition fails and the review of the Petition ends.

Deficiency No. 2: First Stated Reason for Recall is Not Factual or of Sufficient Clarity due to Reference to Multiple Unspecified “Executive Orders”

The Petition states that unidentified “Executive Orders” were signed by an unidentified public official “that prohibit private and public gatherings of any number of people not from the same household which included religious services and required many businesses to close.” This stated reason for recall is not factual and is not sufficiently clear.

First, no business was required to close under any executive order issued by Governor Whitmer. Three executive orders issued by Governor Whitmer in 2020 define critical infrastructure workers and impose restrictions on persons or entities operating a business, but none of the executive orders require businesses to close or cease all operations. Instead, executive orders issued by Governor Whitmer in response to the emergency prompted by COVID-19 permitted businesses necessary to sustain or protect life to continue operations and permitted all businesses to continue to conduct minimum basic operations. As such, there is not a single executive order issued by Governor Whitmer that required any Michigan business to “close” as stated in the Petition. For this reason, the Petition is not factual and misrepresents the content of the executive orders actually issued by Governor Whitmer.

Second, the term “close” can mean many different things. The online Merriam-Webster dictionary includes six (6) separate entries for the term, with over twenty different meanings. (<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/>[visited April 28, 2020]). The term could reference closing the doors and not allowing customers into a facility, while still operating. The term could reference suspending operations for a period of time. The term could mean ceasing operations permanently and discontinuing operations as an ongoing concern. As such, the phrase “required many businesses to close” is not clear and could be misinterpreted by electors.

Third, the executive orders issued by Governor Whitmer do not suspend all public and private gatherings. The actual language used in the executive orders affecting public gatherings indicate that the suspension of public and private gatherings was “subject to the exceptions in.” For example, Section 7 of Executive Order 2020-21 and 2020-42 listed at least 12 exceptions to the suspension of public and private gatherings. Among the exceptions included was attendance at funerals (which often are religious services). Additionally, the restrictions on public or private gatherings under Executive Order 2020-21 and 2020-42 did not prohibit persons from gathering in any number:

To work or volunteer for businesses or operations (including both religious and secular nonprofit organizations) that provide food, shelter, and other necessities of life for economically disadvantaged or otherwise needy individuals, individuals who need assistance as a result of this emergency, and people with disabilities.

See Section 9 of Executive Order 2020-21 and Section 7(a)(11) of Executive Order 2020-42. These orders also never specifically referenced any restrictions or prohibitions relating to religious services. The same is true under Executive Order 2020-77. Additionally, Section 10 of Executive Order 2020-21 and Section 13 of Executive Order 2020-42 indicated that “[c]onsistent with prior guidance, a place of religious worship, when used for religious worship, is not subject to penalty under ... this order.” Executive Order 2020-77 expanded on this earlier guidance stating:

Consistent with prior guidance, neither a place of religious worship nor its owner is subject to penalty under section 20 of this order for allowing religious worship at such place. No individual is subject to penalty under section 20 of this order for engaging in or traveling to engage in religious worship at a place of religious worship, or for violating section 15(a) of this order.

See Section 16 of Executive Order 2020-77.

The Petition, therefore, is not factual. It misrepresents the content of executive orders because it does not reference the exceptions included in the executive orders and fails to inform Michigan electors that individuals could attend legal proceedings without limitation on the number of attendees, funerals with 10 or fewer attendees, or work or volunteer for activities related to providing food and shelter to needy individuals without regard to the number of individuals

gathered for that purpose. Failing to acknowledge these exceptions misrepresents the actual content and effect of executive orders issued by Governor Whitmer. Accordingly, the first stated reason for recall is not factual, of sufficient clarity, misrepresents executive orders and the entire Petition must be rejected.

Unless at least three members of the Board vote affirmatively that the reason addressed in Deficiency No. 2 meets the requirements of the Michigan Election Law, the entire Petition fails and the review of the Petition ends.

Deficiency No. 3: Second Stated Reason for Recall is Not Factual or of Sufficient Clarity Due to Use of Unknown Word and Misleading Description of Executive Orders

The Petition states that certain “Executive Orders” “prohibit many services including many surgeries and medical *proceedures*.” (emphasis added). This stated reason for recall is not factual and is not sufficiently clear. The term “proceedures” does not appear in any available English Dictionary. (see, for example, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/> [visited May 18, 2020] (indicating that the word “proceedures” does not appear in the dictionary)). As such, this reason is not sufficiently clear because the use of unknown term likely would confuse or mislead electors unfamiliar with the term. This statement is also not factual because there is not an executive order issued in 2020 that uses the term “proceedures.”

In addition, the terms “services” and “many” are vague and susceptible to multiple interpretations. Consistent with prior Board decisions, this renders the Petition language insufficiently clear. Accordingly, the second stated reason for recall is not factual or of sufficient clarity and the entire Petition must be rejected.

Finally, to the extent the Petition is referring to Executive Order 2020-17, the stated reason misrepresents the content of this Executive Order because it is limited to “elective procedures” as defined in the Executive Order. Executive Order 2020-17 also specifically excludes the following medical procedures from temporary suspension:

surgeries related to advanced cardiovascular disease (including coronary artery disease, heart failure, and arrhythmias) that would prolong life; oncological testing, treatment, and related procedures; pregnancy-related visits and procedures; labor and delivery; organ transplantation; and procedures related to dialysis [...and] emergency or trauma-related procedures where postponement would significantly impact the health, safety, and welfare of the patient.

The Petition, therefore, misrepresents executive orders issued by Governor Whitmer, is not factual and clear, and the second stated reason for recall must be rejected as deficient.

Unless at least three members of the Board vote affirmatively that the reason addressed in Deficiency No. 3 meets the requirements of the Michigan Election Law, the entire Petition fails and the review of the Petition ends.

Deficiency No. 4: Third Stated Reason for Recall is Not Factual or of Sufficient Clarity Due to Use of Unknown Word and Failure to Identify Statement

The Petition states that an unidentified official made “the statement that abortion is a ‘life-sustaining’ medical *procedure*.” (emphasis added). This stated reason for recall is not factual and is not sufficiently clear. The term “proceedures” does not appear in any available English Dictionary. (see, for example, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/> [visited May 18, 2020] (indicating that the word “proceedures” does not appear in the dictionary)). This reason is, therefore, not sufficiently clear because the use of unknown term likely would confuse or mislead electors unfamiliar with the term. This statement is also not factual because Governor Whitmer has not issued any executive order that uses the term “proceedures”. Accordingly, the third stated reason for recall is not factual or of sufficient clarity.

Moreover, the term “statement” is vague and ambiguous. Even assuming this reason is attributable to Governor Whitmer, there is no indication whether the “statement” was written or verbal and there is absolutely no indication as to when this alleged statement was made. The Petition fails to attach any evidence that the statement is contained in any executive order or other official policy statement issued by Governor Whitmer. Without these details, there is simply no way to determine whether the statement was made as part of Governor Whitmer’s current term of office or as part of her official duties.

As such, the third stated reason for recall fails to meet the statutory requirements and the entire Petition must be rejected.

Unless at least three members of the Board vote affirmatively that the reason addressed in Deficiency No. 4 meets the requirements of the Michigan Election Law, the entire Petition fails and the review of the Petition ends.

Deficiency No. 5: Fourth Stated Reason for Recall is Not Factual or of Sufficient Clarity Because It Fails to Identify Specific Executive Orders and Misrepresents the Content of Executive Orders

The Petition indicates that unspecified executive orders were signed by an unnamed official, that “suspend provisions of the Open Meetings Act that would otherwise require a physical presence, such as, the Michigan Board of State Canvassers meetings.” This stated reason for recall is not factual, is not sufficiently clear, and to the extent it references executive orders issued by Governor Whitmer, it misrepresents the content of executive orders issued by Governor Whitmer.

The fourth stated reason in the Petition does not reference Governor Whitmer or allege that she engaged in any specific course of conduct. For this reason alone, the fourth stated reason lacks

clarity and should be rejected. What is more, assuming that this reason refers to Executive Order 2020-15, the Petition misrepresents the content of the order.

While Executive Order 2020-15 did “temporarily suspend[s] rules and procedures relating to physical presence at meetings and hearings of public bodies and other governmental entities in Michigan,” the fourth stated reason fails to disclose that immediately following this statement, the order requires that “These public bodies and entities must continue to conduct public business during this emergency...and the general public must be able to continue to participate in government decision-making without unduly compromising public health, safety, and welfare.”

Executive Order 2020-15 also mandates that:

- (A) A meeting of a public body may be held electronically, including by telephonic conferencing or video conferencing, in a manner in which both the general public and the members of the public body may participate by electronic means.
- (B) A meeting of a public body held electronically must be conducted in a manner that permits two-way communication so that members of the public body can hear and be heard by other members of the public body and so that general public participants can hear members of the public body and can be heard by members of the public body and other participants during a public comment period. The public body also may use technology to facilitate typed public comments that may be read to or shared with members of the public body and other participants.

The Petition, therefore, misrepresents the content of executive orders issued by Governor Whitmer because it does not notify electors that the public bodies must continue to allow for public participation in public meetings in a way that allows the public to meaningfully participate in the public meetings. Failing to acknowledge these procedural safeguards misrepresents the actual content and effect of executive orders issued by Governor Whitmer. Accordingly, the fourth stated reason for recall is not factual, of sufficient clarity, and misrepresents the content of executive orders, and, thus, the entire Petition must be rejected.

Unless at least three members of the Board vote affirmatively that the reason addressed in Deficiency No. 5 meets the requirements of the Michigan Election Law, the entire Petition fails and the review of the Petition ends.

Deficiency No. 6: Fifth Stated Reason for Recall is Not Factual or of Sufficient Clarity Because It Uses Unknown Rules and Fails to Indicate Which of Multiple Recall Petitions Filed Against Jackson Sheriff Steve Rand is Referenced

The fifth stated reason for recall in the Petition states:

Not removing Jackson Sheriff Steve Rand from office for allegations of mocking an employee for his disability, making a comment about making a snuff film with a courthouse employee, and using racial slurs described in a 264 page packet *submitted* to Governor Whitmer by Jackson Mayor Derek Dobies. (emphasis added)

The term “submitted” does not appear in any available English Dictionary. (see, for example, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/> [visited May 18, 2020] (indicating that the word “submitted” does not appear in the dictionary)). This statement is not sufficiently clear because the use of unknown term likely would confuse or mislead electors unfamiliar with the term. Accordingly, the fifth stated reason for recall is not factual or of sufficient clarity.

Moreover, there is no reference to when the alleged conduct by Governor Whitmer occurred or which of multiple recall petitions submitted to Governor Whitmer regarding Sheriff Rand by Mayor Dobies is referenced. Absent such a temporal bearing and identification of the actual recall petition, neither Governor Whitmer nor the electors can reasonably determine that the course of conduct as alleged occurred during Governor Whitmer’s current term of office. The Petition also fails to attach any evidence that any “packet” was sent by Jackson Mayor Derek Dobies or that it was ever received, reviewed, or considered by Governor Whitmer. As such, the Board should reject the Fifth stated reason because it is not factual or supported by the evidence.

Unless at least three members of the Board vote affirmatively that the reason addressed in Deficiency No. 6 meets the requirements of the Michigan Election Law, the entire Petition fails and the review of the Petition ends.

Deficiency No. 7: Sixth Stated Reason for Recall is Not Factual or of Sufficient Clarity Because It Fails to Reference Specific Conduct by Governor Whitmer

The Sixth stated reason for recall in the Petition is an unspecified “failure to insure that unemployment applicants are able to reach a representative by phone or in person easily.” This reason is not factual and lacks sufficient clarity. The terms “failure” and “easily” are unclear, subjective and not factual, and not supported by evidence. What is more, there is no reference to when the alleged conduct by Governor Whitmer occurred. Absent such a temporal bearing, neither Governor Whitmer nor the electors can reasonably determine that the course of conduct as alleged occurred during Governor Whitmer’s current term of office and more importantly, occurred after January 1, 2020. As such, the Board should reject the Sixth stated reason.

Unless at least three members of the Board vote affirmatively that the reason addressed in Deficiency No. 7 meets the requirements of the Michigan Election Law, the entire Petition fails and the review of the Petition ends.

In sum, there are at least seven (7) independent and compelling reasons why the reasons stated for recall in the Petition fail to satisfy the requirements of the Michigan Election Law. If

Board of Canvassers
May 21, 2020
Page 9

any one of the seven is insufficient, the Board is mandated by the Michigan Election Law to reject the Petition in its entirety. I plan to appear at the clarity hearing on May 22, 2020 at 2:00 p.m. with Gary Gordon of Dykema Gossett PLLC. We look forward to addressing the Board. Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Clark Hill, PLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chris M. Trebilcock".

Christopher M. Trebilcock

CC: Melissa Malerman, Director
Jonathan Brater, Director of Elections and Secretary to the Board of State Canvassers
The Honorable Gretchen E. Whitmer, Governor
elections@michigan.gov
Gary Gordon, Dykema

MICHIGAN ELECTION LAW (EXCERPT)
Act 116 of 1954

168.951a Recall petition under MCL 168.959; requirements; submission to board of state canvassers; determination that reason for recall is factual and of sufficient clarity; notice; meeting; presentation of arguments; appeal; validity of petition.

Sec. 951a. (1) A petition for the recall of an officer listed in section 959 must meet all of the following requirements:

(a) Comply with section 544c(1) and (2).

(b) Be printed.

(c) State factually and clearly each reason for the recall. Each reason for the recall must be based upon the officer's conduct during his or her current term of office. The reason for the recall may be typewritten. If any reason for the recall is based on the officer's conduct in connection with specific legislation, the reason for the recall must not misrepresent the content of the specific legislation.

(d) Contain a certificate of the circulator. The certificate of the circulator may be printed on the reverse side of the petition.

(e) Be in a form prescribed by the secretary of state.

(2) Before being circulated, a petition for the recall of an officer under subsection (1) must be submitted to the board of state canvassers.

(3) The board of state canvassers, not less than 10 days or more than 20 days after submission to it of a petition for the recall of an officer under subsection (1), shall meet and shall determine by an affirmative vote of 3 of the members serving on the board of state canvassers whether each reason for the recall stated in the petition is factual and of sufficient clarity to enable the officer whose recall is sought and the electors to identify the course of conduct that is the basis for the recall. If any reason for the recall is not factual or of sufficient clarity, the entire recall petition must be rejected. Failure of the board of state canvassers to meet as required by this subsection constitutes a determination that each reason for the recall stated in the petition is factual and of sufficient clarity to enable the officer whose recall is being sought and the electors to identify the course of conduct that is the basis for the recall.

(4) The board of state canvassers, not later than 3 business days after receipt of a petition for the recall of an officer as provided under subsection (2), shall notify the officer whose recall is sought of each reason stated in the recall petition and of the date of the meeting of the board of state canvassers to consider whether each reason is factual and of sufficient clarity.

(5) The officer whose recall is sought and the sponsors of the recall petition may appear at the meeting and present arguments on whether each reason is factual and of sufficient clarity.

(6) The determination by the board of state canvassers may be appealed by the officer whose recall is sought or by the sponsors of the recall petition drive to the court of appeals. The appeal must be filed not more than 10 days after the determination of the board of state canvassers. If a determination of the board of state canvassers is appealed to the court of appeals, the recall petition is not valid for circulation and must not be circulated until a determination of whether each reason is factual and of sufficient clarity is made by the court of appeals or until 40 days after the date of the appeal, whichever is sooner.

(7) A petition is not valid for circulation if at any time the court of appeals determines that each reason on the recall petition is not factual and of sufficient clarity.

(8) A recall petition is valid for 180 days after either of the following, whichever occurs later:

(a) The date of determination of whether each reason is factual and of sufficient clarity by the board of state canvassers.

(b) The sooner of the following:

(i) The date of determination of whether each reason is factual and of sufficient clarity by the court of appeals.

(ii) Subject to subsection (7), 40 days after the date of the appeal under subsection (6).

(9) A recall petition that is filed after the 180-day period described in subsection (8) is not valid and must not be accepted by the filing official under section 961. This subsection does not prohibit a person from resubmitting a recall petition for a determination of sufficient clarity and factualness under this section.

History: Add. 2012, Act 417, Imd. Eff. Dec. 20, 2012;—Am. 2018, Act 190, Imd. Eff. June 20, 2018.

Compiler's note: Enacting section 2 of Act 417 of 2012 provides:

"Enacting section 2. As provided in section 5 of 1846 RS 1, MCL 8.5, this act is severable."

Enacting section 3 of Act 417 of 2012 provides:

"Enacting section 3. The legislature recognizes the importance of the electoral process, and it is the intent of the legislature that this amendatory act uphold each of the following:

- (a) Section 4 of article II of the state constitution of 1963.
- (b) Section 8 of article II of the state constitution of 1963.
- (c) Section 26 of article V of the state constitution of 1963."

Popular name: Election Code